[G. / 11.]
200—7-9-96.

Political (1897) Department.

~~ORDINARY~~

~~G.O., No.~~

Confidential No 7.

DATED 22-1-97

C8 / 43

[Despatch Abstract.]

Titles for the sons of Rajas.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Con	141/96						

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Con	180 of 97						

[G./10]
200—29-7-96.

Political (1896) Department.

CURRENT No.

Confidential No. 319

From The Hon. Mr J. D. Rees C.I.E.

Order

No.

Dated 8 }
Received 13 } Nov 96.
Registered 14 }
Enclosures
Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Re titles for the sons of Rajas &c.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

8 - 11 - 96

THE RESIDENCY
TRAVANCORE & COCHIN

CHIEF SECRETARY
P.T.O.
13. NOV. 1896
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

My dear Arundel,

Your D.O. no 1411 Confl d/5 Nov 96. The circular enclosed affects the princes of Travancore & Cochin, who are clansmen, but not sons of hereditary Raja & Maharaja. The titles of Kunwar & Mian would I think be unintelligible & inappropriate upon the Malabar Coast, & to prescribe their use would not result in their being used in any but official papers. It is said in the letter that there is no wish P.T.O. to interfere with any time honoured customs in particular families. Yours sincerely J.D. Rees.

To the particular title Kanwar, which as a foreign Sanscrit or Hindi word is in itself inappropriate for use in a Malayali State, ~~[illegible]~~ the additional objection may be raised that it means "The Son" whereas here the Son is not the heir. Not that an argument of this sort is needed – I think – on this occasion.

[illegible]

[G. / 10]
200—29-7-96.

Political (1896) Department.

CURRENT No.

Confidential No. 324

From R. C. C. Carr Esq

Order

No.

Dated 17
Received 17 } Nov 96.
Registered 18
Enclosures
Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Re titles to ~~Sons~~ of Zamindar Rajas.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

D. O. No. 49.

CHIEF SECRETARY
17 NOV. 1896
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Confidential No 324

Revenue Board Office,
(Land Revenue),
MADRAS,
17th November 1896.

My dear Mr Arundel

In compliance with your D.O. of the 5th instant, I am directed to submit the views of the Board of Revenue on the question of titles to be given to the sons of Zemindar Rajas. The papers have been placed before the Full Board.

2. It is considered that in the case of hereditary Rajas the eldest son should bear the title of Kumar Raja, but the younger son or sons should be allowed no title at all. This proposal is in accordance with the custom prevailing in this Presidency, in so far as the Members of the Board are aware, and no reference has been made to Collectors as it is understood that you have yourself addressed them on the subject.

no

3. As regards the sons of gentlemen bearing the *personal* title of Raja, the Members do not think that even a courtesy title should be acknowledged. It is not expected, except perhaps in

cases

cases where the grant of the life title is regarded as a partial recognition of a hereditary claim, and in such cases the concession would be liable to be misunderstood. Moreover it is opposed to the practice at home where the Law Lords in Scotland, for example, do not gain any distinctive title for their sons, or even it may be added for their wives.

Yours Sincerely

Ripon

[G. / 73]
800—30-7-96.

NOTE FOR THE Second Assistant

Please see the D.O. from the Board of Revenue.(Con No 324)

A reference to all Collrs seems to be unnecessary
[initials]

No reference has been made to Collectors as supposed by the Board -

The Board's reply is not quite complete - It does not refer to the Malayali Rajas on the Malabar coast where, the Hon. Mr Rees* says, "the titles of Kunwar and Mian would be unintelligible and inappropriate" -

Consdt. 319.

The Malayali Rajas are given on pages 6-9 and page 28-29 of the Titles List. In the case of the Zamorin the heir has already the complimentary style of Raja. In view of the above remark of the Hon. Mr Rees it might not be considered desirable to make a second reference to the Board or to call for the views of the Collector of Malabar.

* Sultan Musa Ali Raja of Cannanore

?

Submitted to the Chief

Secretary - The Board might, it is submitted, be asked to report with reference to the Malayali Rajas, and the following D.O. is submitted for ~~[illegible]~~ approval.

My dear Carr,

Your confidl. D.O. No. 49 of the 17th instant. The Board does not appear to have considered the cases of the hereditary Malayali Rajas. The titles of Kunwar and Mian would, so far as can be seen, be unintelligible and inappropriate in their cases. A reference to the Collector of Malabar would probably clear up the point.

Yours sincerely

[initials] 19.11.96

Mr Rees's reply is I think suffct. There are no Rajahs except the Zamorin & Sultan Ali.

[initials] 20.11.96

[G/74]
4,0?0—13-8-05.

NOTE FOR THE ~~CHIEF~~ SA SECRETARY.

With reference to the CS's note it is submitted that there are 8 Malayali Rajas (Page 8 of Titles List) besides the Zamorin and the Ali Raja - But if Mr Rees's reply applies to these two, it will apply to the others as well.

NB
21/11

Yes Keep

[initials]
21/11

[illegible]

With reference to the C.S.'s note it is submitted that there are 8 Malayali ([illegible]) Rajas, besides the Zamorin and the Ali Raja. But if the Resident's reply applies to these too, it will apply to the others as well.

[illegible]

[G./10]
200—29-7-96.

Political (1896.) Department.

~~CURRENT No.~~

Confidential No. 330

From

C.M. Mullaly Esq

Order

No.

Dated 20 } Nov 96
Received 23
Registered 23
Enclosures
Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Titles for the Sons of Rajas &c

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

CONFIDENTIAL 330

Camp Chagalmarri
20th November 96.

CHIEF SECRETARY GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS 23 NOV. 1896

My dear Arundel,

In reply to your D.O. no: 141 dated 5th Inst. enclosing D.O. from the Foreign Department, I beg to state that the former rulers of Banganapalle were called Jaghirdars. In 1875, the title of Nawab in perpetuity was conferred on the present ruler under a

Sanad.

2. The present Nawab has 3 sons who were being styled "Khan Bahadur" till 1895 in accordance with the old custom of the family, but Govt in its order no: 621 dated 14th Septr 95, Confidential, directed the discontinuance of the practice.

3. In the genealogical tree, copy submitted, under the name of the Nawab's eldest son, the word "Heir apparent"

is noted and the literal translation of it, I am told, is "wali abd" which is an exact equivalent of "Kunwar" in Bengali.

4. "Mian", I am told, is a term of affection used in addressing children and master of a house. As to its suitability for a title, I am unable to speak.

5. The reference apparently is about Hindu Rajahs; if this is so, it cannot be

made applicable to the Bana-
ganapalle family for which
some such title as "Nawabza-
-dah" (Nawab's son) would
appear to be more suitable.

Yours Sincerely
[illegible]

[G. / 10]
2?—29-7-96.

Political (1896) Department.

~~CURRENT No.~~

Confidential No. 337

From

R. H. Campbell Esq, ICS.

Order

No.

Dated 28 Nov
Received 30 Nov } 1896
Registered 1 Decr
Enclosures
Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Titles for the sons of the Raja of Sandur

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
		Political	

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

CONFIDENTIAL No 337.

Confidential Camp - Adoni

20-11-96

CHIEF SECRETARY'S
30 NOV. 1896
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Dear Mr. Arundel.

I write in reply to your D.O. No 141 of 5th November 1896.

It has not been the custom in the Sandur State to give any distinction title to either the eldest son or the younger sons. I have consulted the Administrator of Sandur on this matter & he says that the title of Kumara Raja might be given to the eldest son but even this he does not strongly advocate. The titles Kunwar & Miain mentioned in the Foreign Dept's

D.O. are not understood in this part of India & would be meaningless as far as Sandur is concerned. My own opinion is that the title of Kumara Rajah may be given to the Eldest son & that the younger sons be given no titular designation.

Yours Sincerely

R. H. Campbell

Ag Collector of Bellary

D.O. 8/17-12-96

My dear Mr Batten,

Will you please let me have an early reply to my D.O. No. 141 confl. of 5th ultimo regarding the style of addressing the sons of H. Hthe Raja of Pudukotta

Cu(?) 15.12.96

N.L.A. 17.12

Submit to C.S. with fair

[Pencil, left margin:] S Let me have a pencil precis of replies Cu(?) 16/12

J.K. Batten Esq. I.C.S. Despd 17/12

Note

All the others have replied
N.S. 14/12

[G./10]
200—29-7-06.

Poll (1896) Department.

CURRENT No.

Confidential No. 364

From

J. K. Batten Esq

Order

No.

Dated 29 } Decr 96.
Received 30 }
Registered
Enclosures
Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Titles for the sons of the Raja of Pudukottai

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

CHIEF SECRETARY
30-DEC. 1896
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Collector's Office,
TRICHINOPOLY,
29 - Dec 1896.

Confidential

CONFIDENTIAL. No 364

Dear Mr. Arundel.

With reference to your D.O. No. 141 dated 5th Nov. 1896, I have the honour to state that in my opinion the titles "Kunwar" & "Mian" are unsuitable to a Tamil State such as Pudukkottai - The existing custom

appears to me to call
the sons & daughters
of the Rajah, Prince
and Princess (with
the prefix Senior &
Junior &c.) and the
grandsons & grand-
daughters Dorai Rajah
and Rajayi respectively
The titles of Princess
Dorai Rajah & Rajayi
are in actual use
but as the present

Rajah is adopted there has been no Prince for some time, so I cannot be certain as to the customary title for the Rajah's son, but from analogy he would be called Prince.

yrs sincerely

W Satter

Pol. agent

~~Yours sincerely~~

C. 7/1/97
R. 7/1/97

[G./25]
500—3-10-96.

Political DEPARTMENT.

Co. No's 319, 324, 330, 337 & 364

1. H. E. THE GOVERNOR. (first)

2. THE HON'BLE MR. BLISS, C.I.E.

3. THE HON'BLE MR. GROSE, C.I.E.

SUBJECT.

Titles for the sons of Rajas

FOR ORDERS.

× D

In its circular No. of the 13th October the Govt. of India asked for the views of this Govt. as regards the titles which should be given to the eldest and the younger sons of Rajas in the case (a) where the title of Raja is hereditary and (b) where the title is personal only – It enquired if there would be any objection to styling the eldest son of hereditary Rajas 'Kunwar' (= Prince) and the younger sons 'Mian' (= Sir or master) in regard to all new creations and also in regard to old titles where there is no ancient custom to the contrary. In the case of life Rajas the proposal was to grant the courtesy title of "Kunwar" to the elde

...est son, the younger sons
...ing conceded no distinctive
...pellation -

Taking first the hereditary
maharajas (and it is presumed
that India's proposal is intended
to apply to them) and Rajas
there are in this Presidency:-

Ruling chiefs

(1) The Maharaja of Travancore
(2) The Raja of Cochin
(3) The Raja of Pudukottai
(4) The Nawab of Banganapalle
(5) The Raja of Sandur.

Zamindars &c

The hereditary Rajas Nos
5*-24 in the Titles List, the
Prince of Arcot and Sultan
Musa Ali Raja of Cannanore

* 5. Vizianagram and 6. Jeypore are also life Maharajas.

. The Govt. of India's proposal
has been referred to the several
Political officers and to the
Board of Revenue - The replies
are contained in the currents
quoted above.

4. The Resident in Travancore
and Cochin considers that the
titles of "Kunwar" and "Mian"
would be unintelligible and
inappropriate

inappropriate upon the Malabar
Coast and that their introduction
would not result in their being
used in any but official papers.
The heirs to the states of Travancore
and Cochin are styled "Elaya
Rajas" and are classed as
hereditary Rajas (Nos 2 & 24 in
the titles list) and the younger
brothers of the heirs are styled
"Princes". These titles are of
long standing.

The Political Agent, Pudukottai
is of opinion that the titles of
"Kunwar" and "Mian" are
unsuitable to a Tamil State
like Pudukottai. The existing
custom is to call the sons and
daughters of the Raja "Prince"
and "Princess" (with the prefix
Senior, Junior &c) and the
grandsons and granddaughters
"Dorai Raja" and "Rajayi"
respectively. The titles of
Princess, Dorai Raja and Rajayi
are in actual use, but as the
present Raja was adopted by his
grandfather there has been no
Prince for some time.

The Political Agent, Banganapalle

in doubt as to whether the
circular from the Govt of India
refers to "Nawabs" or merely to
Hindu Rajas. The Govt. of
India has objected to the sons
of the Nawab of Banganapalle
being styled "Khan Bahadur"
and the titles of "Kunwar" and
"Mian" would perhaps be
appropriate for the sons of a
Muhammadan Chief. Mr.
Mullaly suggests that the eldest
son of the Nawab may be styled
either "Wali ahd" (= heir-apparent)
or "Nawabzadah" (= Nawab's son)

The Political Agent, Sandur,
reports that the titles "Kunwar"
and "Mian" would be meaningless
so far as Sandur is concerned
and suggests that the title of
Kumara Raja" may be given to
the eldest son, the younger sons
being given no titular designation.

As regards the Zamindar
Rajas the Board of Revenue
considers that the eldest sons of
hereditary Rajas should bear
the title of "Kumar Raja" and
that the younger sons should
be allowed no title at all.

+ page 4 of GO. No. 194 Poll
d 22-8-95 B

this proposal being in accordance with the custom prevailing in this Presidency so far as the members of the Board of Revenue are aware.

The Board of Revenue does not refer to the Malayali Rajas given on pages 6-9 & 28-29 of the Titles List. In the case of the Zamorin the heir has already the complimentary form of address of Raja[*] - As observed by the Hon. Mr Rees the titles of "Kumar" and "Mian" would be unintelligible in the case of these Rajas.

* No 14 in Titles List.

5. As regards perso[nal] Rajas the Board of Revenue considers that even a cour[tesy] title should not be conced[ed] and this opinion may, it [is] submitted, be accepted.

6. In the cases of Travan[core] and Cochin there is ancient custom against the proposal [of] the G. of I. which would a[lso] apparently wish to make any change in regard to [the] distinctive title now borne

heirs (not necessarily the sons of the ruling chief) to the musnad. In Pudukottai there does not appear to be any such ~~custom~~ recognised custom & it is not clear why the Political Agent should object to the use of "Kumar Raja" for the eldest son. Sandur is ~~also~~ in favour of such a proposal. It is not clear whether the G. of I. intended its proposal to extend to the Nawab of Banganapalle, the Prince of Arcot & Sultan Musa Ali Raja of Cannanore who are Muhammadans. For the Zamindar & non. Malayali Rajas the title of "Kumara Raja" for the ~~you~~ eldest son would seem to be appropriate. None [of] the authorities consulted appear [to] be in favour of treating [you]nger sons specially. On the [wh]ole it will be seen that [u]niformity is impossible in [th]e Presidency & it would perhaps [be] best to leave the matter [alo]ne. If it is decided to make [an]y definite proposals to [Ind]ia the opinions of the

* now in title list.

Yes.
2.9.11

Translators to Govt. might be obtained (confidentially) as to the most appropriate titles for the elder sons of hereditary Rajas in this Presidency.

C.a.S
6.1.97

I submit that the best course is to leave matters in this Presidency alone. No one is as far as I am aware dissatisfied with the

[illegible]
6/1/97

I fully agree with the Chief Sec.

A.S.H
7.1.97

[illegible]
9/1/97

[illegible]
11/1/97

C. 19/1/97
R. 21/1/97

Political Dept

Con. Nos 319, 324, 330, 337 & 364

H.E. the Governor

For Orders

7.54 20.1.97

It is, perhaps, unnecessary to give a precis of the replies from Pol. Officers & the Board?

ACS 14.1.97

Not necessary. I submit ?

D.O.

My dear Cuningham,

With reference to Mr Barnes' D.O. of the 13th October 1896 regarding the grant of titles to the eldest and the younger sons of Rajas, I am directed to say that, after consulting Pol. officers, His Excellency in Council considers that no change is called for in this Presidency. No Raja is, as far as ~~can be ascertained~~ Govt is aware, dissatisfied with the existing state of affairs. It would moreover be impossible to ~~confer a title which would be suitable to the sons of the various Rajas in this Presidency~~ secure any uniformity in the matter ~~within Presidency~~.

Yours sincerely,
(From orders)

ACS 14.1.97

18/1/97

W. J. Cuningham Esq. C.S.I.

Despd 27/1/97

Political Depts

Con. Nos. 319, 324, 330, 337 & 364

D.O.

My dear Cunningham,

With reference to [illegible] Benares' D.O. of the 13th October 189[illegible] regarding the grant of titles to the eldest and the younger sons of Rajas, I am directed to say that His Excellency in Council considers that no change is called for in this Presidency. No Raja is, so far as can be ascertained, dissatisfied with the existing state of affairs. It would moreover be impossible to confer a title which would be acceptable to the sons of the various Rajas in this Presidency.

Yours sincerely

(Sd.) [illegible]

py sent to Press.

ed for Signature.

tched.

IN G.O., No. DATED

189 ,

NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED.
- Order complete.
- Letter only.
- Order complete with Letter

Spare Copies.

Struck .. ..

Issued .. ..

Total ..

In hand ..

T No.

LOSURES TO C. No.

OF GOVERNMENT .. .. ..

ER OF GOVERNMENT.

TEMENT WITH DITTO

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.

CONFIDENTIAL.